thus distinguished these *groups* [italics mine], I shall mention all the true Cornus, . . ." From the above it will be seen that *Cynoxylon* and *Eukrania* are parallel categories and that if one is a genus so is the other; or if a subgenus, so is the other. The "C." under each stands for *Cornus* and the species mentioned are the *Cornus* species referred to each group and cannot in any sense be construed as new combinations under each name respectively. Rafinesque made no combinations under either name, here or elsewhere, so far as I am able to determine. In the Medical Flora, Vol. 1, page 132 (1828) Rafinesque named and defined *Cornus*, section *Cynoxylon* for the Flowering Dogwood, *C. florida* Linn. This antedates and supersedes Section *Benthamidia* Spach. In Alsog. Am. p. 59, he raises it to subgeneric rank. That *Eukrania* is only a subgeneric name is proved by Rafinesque himself in this same paper (Alsog. Am.) where, on page 63, he lists and describes a species of *Cornus* as "281 *Cornus* (Eukrania) *cyananthes* Raf. atl. j. 151." I think the evidence is quite emphatic enough that Rafinesque, himself, considered the names "Cynoxylon" and "Eukrania" as subgeneric only. Under the International Rules, the name *Eukrania* must be retained for the group having the larger number of species, hence I choose *Cornus Canadensis* Linn as its type. *Cynoxylon* and *Eukrania* as genera would start with the Index Kewensis; likewise the binomials under them; the author of the genera and the binomials is of course B. D. Jackson, Editor of the Index Kewensis. Even this would make *Eukrania* antedate either *Chamaepericlymenum* or *Cornella*. I am indebted to Mr. C. C. Deam of Bluffton, Ind., for a copy of Rafinesque's paper on *Cornus* in the Alsographia.

DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY,
PARKE, DAVIS & CO.,
DETROIT, MICH.

THE IDENTITY AND NOMENCLATURE OF APOCYNUM ANDROSAEMIFOLIUM L.—During the course of a monograph[1] of the genus *Apocynum* published about two years ago, the writer subdivided the Linnaean *A. androsaemifolium* into two principal varieties, together with one other of local and minor importance. One of those varieties, indigenous to the northwestern United States and adjacent Canada from Nebraska and the Dakotas to British Columbia and northern Califor-

[1] Woodson, R. E., Jr. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. **17**: 41–149. 1930.

nia, was interpreted as fulfilling the original description[1] of the species with regard to the glabrity of the dorsal surface of the foliage, whereas the variety with the dorsal leaf-surface predominantly more or less pubescent, common to the northeastern States and adjacent Canada and to a less extent generally westward, was designated as coinciding with the requirements of A. de Candolle's var. *incanum*. This interpretation was the one previously made by the only revisors[2] of the genus, since the time of de Candolle, who had considered the eastern and the western plants as representing distinct varieties.

However, in spite of his diagnosis of the dorsal leaf-surface of the species as glabrous, Linnaeus stated that his plants had their habitat "in Virginia, Canada." Furthermore, according to Prof. M. L. Fernald, the specimen from the Hortus Cliffortianus preserved in the herbarium of the British Museum (Natural History) actually has the dorsal leaf-surface glabrous, and upon the foliage of a specimen of doubtful origin incorporated in the herbarium of Linnaeus at the Linnean Society of London the trichomes are perceptible only with the aid of a hand-lens. As a matter of fact "glabrous" was a relative term of not too great exactitude in the time of Linnaeus, and under the circumstances it is easy to see how the commonly pubescent eastern variety was so described.

In the light of the foregoing considerations it is undoubtedly necessary to restore the typical designation to the eastern plants, in which case var. *glabrum* Macoun, Cat. Can. Pl. **2**: 317. 1884 is the correct name of the western variety.—R. E. Woodson, Jr., Missouri Botanical Garden.

A FEW NOTEWORTHY PLANTS FROM SOUTHERN VERMONT

Richard J. Eaton and Ludlow Griscom

On September 4 and 5, 1931, the writers made two botanical trips, primarily for reconnaissance, to the valleys of the Connecticut River and its tributaries in southern Vermont and New Hampshire. No attempt was made to explore any one locality systematically or to collect a representative series of plants. Only such specimens were taken as appeared unusual or of personal interest. No mention

[1] L. Sp. Pl. ed. 1. 213. 1753.

[2] cf. Beguinot, A., & N. Belosersky R. Accad. Lincei Atti, Mem. Cl. Sci. Fis. V. **9**: 670–671. 1913.